

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
AT BECKLEY**

CHARLES W. JONES,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:24-cv-00505

WARDEN, FCI BECKLEY [SIC],

Respondent.

ORDER

Pending is Petitioner Charles W. Jones' *pro se* Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [ECF 1], filed July 22, 2024, as well as Respondent's Motion to Dismiss [ECF 13], filed December 4, 2024. This action was previously referred to the Honorable Joseph K. Reeder, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation ("PF&R"). Magistrate Judge Reeder filed his PF&R on May 12, 2025, recommending that the Court grant Respondent's Motion to Dismiss, deny Petitioner's § 2241 Petition, dismiss the matter with prejudice, and remove the matter from the Court's docket.

The Court need not review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations *to which objection is made.*" (emphasis added)). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal the Court's order. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also United States v. De Leon-Ramirez*, 925 F.3d 177, 181 (4th Cir. 2019) (Parties may not typically "appeal a magistrate judge's

findings that were not objected to below, as § 636(b) doesn't require de novo review absent objection."); *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989). Further, the Court need not conduct de novo review when a party "makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Objections in this case were due on May 29, 2025. No objections were filed.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R [ECF 14], **GRANTS** Respondent's Motion to Dismiss [ECF 13], **DISMISSES** the Petitioner for Writ of Habeas Corpus [ECF 1], and **DISMISSES** the matter.

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to transmit a copy of this Order to any counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: May 30, 2025



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Frank W. Volk".

Frank W. Volk
Chief United States District Judge